

AMENDMENTS**IN THE SPECIFICATION:**

Please amend the title on the first page, line one of the specification, as shown in the attached page entitled "Amendment to Specification for Attorney Docket Number LeA 32 545" (page 5 of this amendment).

IN THE CLAIMS:

Kindly amend the claims as follows:

Please amend claim 9 as shown in the attached pages entitled "Amended Claims for Attorney Docket Number LeA 32 545" (page 7 of this amendment). A marked version of the claim set showing the changes made is also attached (page 8 of this amendment).

Please add new claim 10 as shown in the attached pages entitled "New Claims for Attorney Docket Number LeA 32 545" (page 6 of this amendment).

REMARKS

Claims 9 and 10 are pending in this application. Claim 9 has been amended and new claim 10 has been added. These claim amendments and additions are made to clarify the subject matter therein. Therefore, these amendments are submitted in order to place the claims in condition for allowance, and do not disclaim any subject matter to which the Applicants are entitled.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In paragraph 6 (pages 2-3) of Paper No. 13, the Examiner rejected claim 9 under U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kruse et al., (1993) in view of Duschl, (1995). Applicants respectfully traverse.

To properly maintain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, three conditions must be met. First, the prior art must have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art that they should make the claimed composition or device or carry out the claimed process. Second, the prior art must also have revealed that in so making or carrying out, those of ordinary skill in the art would have a reasonable expectation of success. Both the suggestion and the reasonable expectation of success must be adequately founded in the prior art and not in the Applicant's disclosure. Finally, the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See *In re Vaeck*, 20 USPQ2d 1438, 1442 (Fed. Cir. 1991).